

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS
THEOLOGY OF ROME AND OF
CANTERBURY IN A NUTSHELL
BY REV. H. C. SEMPLE, S.J.



perty
of the
NOVITIATE
RMAL SC
CAN

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

6-28246

.35-



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS

THEOLOGY OF
ROME AND OF CANTERBURY
IN A NUTSHELL

BY
REV. H. C. SEMPLE, S.J.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS
PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE
1906

Permissu Superiorum.

Nihil Obstat.

REMY LAFORT,

Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur.

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY,

Archbishop of New York.

NEW YORK, June 24, 1906.

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.

THIS is ever a live question, and, although the ancient and modern classics on it would fill a library, the busy Catholic may welcome something which he can read as he runs, — something not new, but short and full, which will unpuzzle his own mind and that of his Anglican friend.¹ This tiny pamphlet, in the garb of catechism, and in homely words that all can catch at first glance, will sum up the great case by

¹ Cf. the *Civiltà Cattolica* and *London Tablet* of 1896-1897. This article is a completion of an unsigned conference of similar title published by Father Semple in the *Am. Eccl. Review*, June, 1897.

giving its main *laws* and *facts* in their core or root, so that each one may judge it for himself and not from hearsay. Truths bearing on the case will not be shirked or minced. But the writer trusts that his style will show his one aim to be that "the truth may appear, and not that he may seem to have the upper hand." And if there can be found any tinge of unkindliness in his way of saying things, he will feel mortified at having missed his lesson of manners taught by Pope Leo XIII. in his Bull and by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their reply.

On the Ides of September, 1896, Leo, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, not in the less solemn form of a Brief sealed with the Fisherman's ring, but in the most solemn form of a Bull sealed with the images

of Saints Peter and Paul and using his supreme apostolic authority, for a perpetual memorial of the matter, pronounced and declared that ordinations according to the Anglican rite have been, and are, null and void; and, on November 5, 1896, he wrote in a brief to the Archbishop of Paris that this decision is irrevocable.

Was his utterance uncalled for? Leo had shortly before issued an address to all Christians to come back to unity of faith and action, and he had followed this up by a special appeal to the English. For two years some French and Italian priests of great learning had been holding that Anglican ordinations are valid. A noble leader of the Anglican High Church had, through a distinguished French ecclesiastic, begged Rome to reopen the case, and hear and

weigh new documents and make a decision that might be a basis of reunion of the English church with its Roman mother. Therefore the Pope's utterance was not uncalled for.

Was the procedure of Rome fair and kind, in choosing and hearing its committee named to examine and report? Note the make-up of the committee. The Chairman is Cardinal Mazzella. He has taught many years at Woodstock, Maryland, and is proud of his American citizenship. The Secretary is Monsignor Merry del Val. He is the distinguished son of his distinguished English mother. The Abbé Duchesne and Father De Augustinis, S.J., hold that Anglican ordinations are *certainly valid*. Abbot Gasquet, O.S.B., Father David, O.S.F., and Canon Moyes

hold that they are *certainly invalid*. Monsignor Gasparri holds that they are *probably valid*. Father Scannell differs from Canon Moyes on the value of certain documentary evidence, and Father Llaveneras has not expressed any opinion. This is certainly not a packed jury. The members of this committee see placed before them all the papers of the Vatican archives which bear on the case (which archives had been thrown open to the scholars of the world since 1894), and they must even search the hitherto unexplored secret records of the Inquisition. They must consider not only the rulings and reasons of the Roman court in the previous trials of the case through three hundred and fifty years, but also the arguments of Anglicans, with whose spokesmen some of the board are in close touch.

Each member writes his opinion and passes it to the others. They hold twelve sessions, and debate is free and thorough.

America, Ireland, England, Spain, France, Italy; the orders of St. Benedict, St. Francis, St. Ignatius; the Roman prelature, the secular priesthood; history, canon law, dogmatic theology, and all their opposing schools, by able representatives meet and clash in mental *mêlée*, where every champion is on his mettle and finds a foe worthy of his steel. The liveliest tilts are said to have been those between the two Jesuits, Mazzella and De Augustinis.

The minutes of all the meetings with all the papers and debates of these specialists are laid before the Suprema or highest committee of Cardinals, over which the Pope presides in person. After careful

study the Suprema votes, and votes unanimously, that the case against Anglican orders had already been finally decided by Rome, and that the present discussion had served only to confirm the accuracy of Rome's conclusions and reasons. But the Holy Father, having taken all the means which the wisdom of the whole world can lend to find out the whole truth, still waits and prays lest the time may not be ripe for his own last word. At length he makes up his mind that silence in him now would favor the belief that Anglicans have the true priesthood and the sacrifice and sacraments that depend upon it, and that this belief would do harm to souls, and he issues the Bull "*Apostolicæ Curæ.*"

What are the precise words of the conclusion or enacting clause in the Bull? "We

pronounce and declare that ordinations made according to the Anglican Ordinal have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." Observe the words, "Ordinations, etc." The Pope does not touch the question whether there may be here and there among Anglicans some true bishops or priests, or whether some Anglicans may have received valid orders from heretical or schismatical bishops according to a rite approved by Rome. His decree regards only the ordinations according to the Edwardine Ordinal.

What are the Pope's reasons for his conclusion? Some Catholic writers had held that Matthew Parker, Queen Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, from whom the Anglican orders have their source, was never seriously consecrated, or that

his consecrator was not a true bishop. But this plea had always been ruled out at Rome, as the Records show. Therefore the Pope's reasons are two others: first, that his predecessors by word and act had always held that Anglican ordinations are invalid, on account of a defect of form and intention in the Edwardine Ordinal; and, second, that there *is* this defect of form and intention in the Ordinal. His first reason is extrinsic authority or precedent. His second reason is his own intrinsic consideration of the words and context of the ordinal. His first argument therefore is historical, and his second theological.

What are the main historical facts of the case in outline, according to the Roman record? In 1534, Henry VIII. cut off

England from Rome, and he continued to reign until 1547. All the ordinations of priests and consecrations of bishops in England during this time were recognized as valid by Rome and its delegate, Cardinal Pole. Why? Because they were made by real bishops and according to the rite of the Roman Pontifical.

Edward VI. reigned from 1547 to 1553. The orders conferred from 1547 to 1550 were also recognized as valid. Why? Because they too were conferred by real bishops and according to the Roman Pontifical. But the orders conferred from 1550 to 1553 were declared by Rome and Pole null and void. Why? Because in 1550 not only was the Roman Missal set aside for the new Communion Service, but also the Roman Pontifical was set

aside for the Ordinal of Edward VI., in which, according to Rome and Pole, there is the essential defect of form and intention.]

Can this fact, that the Popes of Queen Mary's reign taught that orders conferred according to the Edwardine Ordinal are invalid, and invalid for the inherent defect of form and intention in the Ordinal, can this fact be proved by original documents?

The eternal city has not kept on file for three centuries and a half *all* that the Popes and Pole and the Queen did and said in the case. But what it has kept is enough to prove our fact most fully. Julius III., who sent Pole to England, laid down rules how to treat the clergymen he would find there, and these rules were expressed more explicitly by Paul IV. The letter of Julius III., dated August 8,

1554, mentions those clergymen who had been "duly and lawfully promoted to orders," and "others who had not been promoted to orders but might be if found worthy and fit."

Pole's letter of January 29, 1555, subdelegating his own powers to the Bishop of Norwich, mentions clergymen who had been ordained "unduly and not according to the accustomed form of the Church," — "the form and intention of the Church not having been observed." Paul IV., in his letter of June 20, 1555, mentions those "who had been promoted to orders by another than a bishop duly and rightly ordained," and "those who had obtained orders or benefices invalidly and *de facto*."

Paul IV., on October 30 of the same year, says: "Only those bishops and archbishops

who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church cannot be said to be validly and lawfully ordained."

Queen Mary, acting under the guidance of Pole, issued her famous decree: "As those who have already been promoted to any kind of orders according to the newly fabricated method of ordaining, truly and *de facto* have not been ordained at all, etc."

Therefore we see at the outset Rome and Pole and the Queen treating as simple laymen those who had been ordained under the Ordinal of Edward VI., the only form then found in England besides the customary form of the Church; and we see the reason assigned is that the Ordinal is inherently defective and that the defects are those of form and intention. Likewise here we

see the origin of the uniform practice of Rome and of English Catholics of treating as simple laymen all Anglican clergymen who have become Catholics, and of reordaining them, not conditionally but absolutely.

Are there any traces in the ancient English registers of the fact of such reordinations under Pole? The Anglican Bishop Brown of Stepney, in a letter to the *London Times* of May 1, 1896, says he had found fourteen, of which eight were in London. There are others, which the shortness of this booklet will not permit us to begin to discuss.

Is there any reason for saying that the Roman practice of reordaining Anglican clergymen began with the Gordon case in 1704? None whatever. Besides the manifest reasons to the contrary, seen in the

preceding paragraph, we have the following document in the archives of the Roman Inquisition, 1684–1685: “According to usage the Catholics of England receive as simple laymen bishops and priests who are converted. Thus Bristow and the Cardinal of Norfolk.”

What was the Gordon case? John Clement Gordon, a Scotchman, Bishop of Galloway, who had been consecrated under the Anglican rite, having been received into the Catholic Church, came to Rome and asked to be ordained a priest. A copy of the Anglican Ordinal was brought to Rome. Opinions on it were asked not only from Roman scholars, but also from the Universities of Douay and Paris. Extracts from Oriental rituals were translated for comparison with it, and on April 17,

1704, Clement XI. decreed: "John Clement Gordon shall be ordained from the beginning, and unconditionally, to all orders, even sacred orders, and chiefly of priesthood; and in case he has not been confirmed he shall first receive the sacrament of Confirmation." In the *Civiltà*, Father Brandi photographed this document and the first page of the Ordinal that was used. Gordon and some of the canonists had alleged the invalidity of Parker's consecration as a cause of the invalidity of his orders, but this cause was not admitted by the Pope. In after times, when Rome was asked about Anglican orders, it referred to the Gordon case as a precedent, its trial having been so thorough and solemn.

In the face of these facts, how could

scholars like Duchesne, De Augustinis, and Gasparri have held Anglican ordinations to be certainly or probably valid? The Pope excuses them on the ground that they had not seen all the documents.

Let us now take up the Pope's theological reasons against Anglican ordinations being valid. They are two: That the Ordinal is deficient in the essential form of the sacrament of Orders, and in the essential intention of doing what the Church does.

In all rituals for all sacraments there are ceremonies that have been made by the Church and not by Christ. These are useful and pious, but not essential. The sacrament is only in the divinely made rite. This essential rite in the New Law has two essential parts, commonly called the matter

and the form. As a sacrament is a practical sign of grace, it produces grace, but to produce it it must be a sign of it or signify it. This sign or signification of the grace is in the whole rite, matter, and form united. But the matter being a visible substance like water, oil, bread, etc., or being a visible action such as imposition of hands, is the less definite component. The form being *words* associated with the use of these substances or these actions is the more definite component. The form or words therefore determine the matter to be a definite sign of grace. These few abstract terms will be better understood in the course of our argument, which is this:—

- a) *In every sacrament of the New Law
the form or words associated with the*

matter must express the grace produced, in order to produce it.

b) *But in the Edwardine Ordinal the form does not express the grace produced. Therefore in the Edwardine Ordinal the grace cannot be produced.*

The truth of a) is plain from a glance at the various sacraments. In Baptism, what is the grace produced? It is the washing or cleansing of the soul from original or actual sin, and it is expressed in the form or words, "I baptize thee, etc."

In Confirmation, the grace is strengthening of the soul, and it is expressed by the words, "I confirm thee, etc."

In Penance, the grace is forgiveness of sins, and it is expressed in the words, "I absolve thee, etc."

In the Holy Eucharist, the immediate

effect or grace produced is the Real Presence, and it is expressed by the words: "This is My Body: this is My Blood."

In Extreme Unction, the grace produced is soothing of soul and body, and it is expressed in the words, "By this holy unction and His most tender mercy, may the Lord be indulgent to thee, etc."

In Matrimony, the effect produced is the tie with its needful graces, and it is expressed in the words, "I take thee as my wife. I take thee as my husband."

What is true of all the other sacraments is true also of the sacrament of Orders. The effect produced is the diaconate, the priesthood, or the episcopate, and the words of the form pronounced by the bishop with the imposition of hands (the only thing in the Anglican Ordinal that can be considered

as essential matter) must express this effect. It is not essential to express the word, "deacon," "priest," or "bishop," but the form must at least express some clear equivalent. Thus, "the order of Blessed Stephen" is a clear equivalent of the order of Deacon, and "high priest" is an equivalent of Bishop. It is not essential to express the main power of the priest or the bishop in the form, but if this main power were expressed, it too would be an equivalent. However, it is essential to express *either* the order *or* its main power, and if the main power is not only left out but positively excluded, then the right name, though kept, is not the right name in reality but only a shadow. Now, the main power of a true priest is to offer a true sacrifice, and at least one of the main powers

of a bishop is to make priests, which he cannot do if he is not a true priest himself. An ordinal therefore that *positively excludes* the true sacrifice cannot make a true priest or bishop.

That the mention of the special effect or grace is essential in the form of each part of the sacrament of Orders is clear not only from the nature of the sacraments of the New Law and from the teaching of the Council of Trent, but it is made most explicitly clear from the constant and universal practice of the Church. Besides the forms in the Roman Pontifical, the court at Rome had placed under its eyes a diagram of the forms of nine rites, Eastern and Western, ancient and modern, all that ever had been or might have been approved by Rome. These forms mul-

tiplied by three (for deacon, priest, and bishop) make thirty. Now, all thirty forms in the prayer associated with the imposition of hands express the order conferred, either explicitly or equivalently.¹ Therefore we see it is the *locus*, *a*, that in every sacrament of the New Testament the form must express the grace produced in order to produce it.

Now we come to the *locus*, *b*, that in the Edwardine Ordinal the form does not express the grace produced.

Who is the Pope's witness to this fact? The form for making priests and bishops in the Edwardine Ordinal, the letter of its words in its text, and the spirit of the words in its context.

What are the words of the form for or-

¹ See Appendix.

daining a priest? The bishop imposing hands on him says: "Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Now, here there is no mention of the priesthood or the main power of the priesthood, namely, to consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, to offer the true objective Sacrifice of the Eucharist, that is, the Mass.

Is not the priesthood sufficiently specified by the words, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, etc."? No; not even if these words in the Ordinal could bear the same sense as in the Pontifical, the sense of a sacred judicial power. For the power to forgive sins, although special to the priesthood, is not its main power or essence or that which makes the priest. This

main power is to offer the sacrifice. Without this power, the power to forgive sins cannot be received. It is a common saying among Catholic theologians that the priest must receive first the power over the real Body of Christ, and only afterward over the mystic Body of Christ or over the Christian people whose sins he forgives or retains.

What are the words of the form for consecrating a bishop? "Receive the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God that is given thee by this imposition of our hands; for God has not given us the spirit of fear but of power and love and soberness."

In these words there is no mention of a bishop or of his high priesthood or of his power to ordain priests. These words

might be rightly used in making a priest or a deacon or in giving the sacrament of Confirmation. Therefore they do not definitely express the bishop's order or his main power.

What insertions were made in these forms in the year 1662? After the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," there is inserted, respectively, "for the office and work of a priest," and "for the office and work of a bishop."

Was this a sufficient cure or remedy for the original form? This insertion is fairly interpreted as an official recognition that the first form needed a cure or remedy and was invalid.

But, for the sake of argument, suppose that the insertion of 1662 makes the form valid. As a practical cure or remedy it is

more than a hundred years too late. There were then, in the year 1662 (more than one hundred years after the consecration of Parker), no real bishops among the Anglicans, and real bishops are necessary to make real priests. So that even if there was not after the insertion the defect of form and intention, there certainly was the defect of the proper *minister* of the sacrament of Orders.

Although the words of the form be granted in themselves to be vague in sense, is not their sense as specifying priest or bishop made clear and definite from the prayers before and after the form in the Ordinal? No. When the authors of the Ordinal put out the Roman Pontifical, which had been in use in England from time immemorial, they also put out the Missal

for the Communion Service, and they put out the altar for the communion table. And' whereas the Missal and Pontifical had mentioned the sacrificing priesthood or the sacrifice by the priest, in *fifty* different places, the communion service and the Ordinal do not mention them in *one* place. These authors cut out every one of the many previous words or ceremonies that could even be taken as a *trace* of the sacrificing idea., Therefore the prayers before and after the form have not in themselves the sense of the true priesthood or sacrifice, and cannot give this sense to the form.

Note further that in the concrete circumstances the omission of the idea of sacrifice and sacrificing priesthood from the prayers before and after the form is not mere negative omission but most emphatic

positive exclusion. Note the circumstance of the change of the name of the book from Missal to Communion Service. What does this change mean? That in the Eucharist there is no sacrifice, no Mass, but only a sacrament, only the communion or supper. Note the circumstance of the change of the name of the place from altar to communion table. What does this change mean? Again, that in the Eucharist there is no sacrifice, but only communion, only a sacrament. And likewise when the authors of the Ordinal, who had set aside the Missal and Pontifical and altar, cut out the *fifty* references to the true sacrifice which they found in the Pontifical and Missal, what does this change mean? This omission or silence cries out positively that in the Eucharist there is no sacrifice instituted by

Christ, and therefore the context of the form in the Ordinal not only does not give a right sense to the text of the form, but even clearly gives to it its own definite wrong sense. Moreover it gives this same definite wrong sense to the titles "bishop," and "priest," which are at the head or in the body of the Ordinal; namely, it gives them the meaning of bishops and priests who are without the power of sacrifice, without their main or essential power. So that the words "bishop" and "priest" in the Ordinal are mere shadows of the reality. And in conclusion we see what good reasons Pope Leo and his predecessors had for holding and teaching that in the Anglican Ordinal the form does not express the order conferred or its main grace, and that therefore its ordinations

are invalid on account of the defect of form.

We now come to the second part of the Pope's theological argument, namely, that with this defect of form there is intimately connected also the essential defect of *intention*, that is required for a valid sacrament.

What is the teaching of the Catholic Church about the necessity of intention in general for the valid giving of a sacrament? It is enough if the minister of a sacrament has the general serious intention of doing what the Church does. He need not explicitly intend to give a sacrament of Christ or to give a grace through the sacrament. He need not even believe that the rite is a sacrament or that it gives a grace. Thus the Church may recognize baptism as valid and forbid it to be repeated, even though

the minister be a heretic, a Hebrew, or a pagan. The Church cannot know the minister's interior intention directly, but judges of it indirectly from outward acts; and whenever a minister, be he Hebrew, or pagan, or heretic, seriously performs a sacramental rite as it has been approved by the Church, then the Church judges that he had the intention essential for validity, the intention of doing what the Church does.

But, as Pope Leo says, "if the rite is changed for the express purpose of bringing in another not received by the Church, and of changing what the Church does and what belongs to the nature of the sacrament by the institution of Christ, then manifestly not only is the intention requisite for a sacrament absent, but a contrary and repugnant intention is present."

This principle is made clear by the classic precedent of the year A.D. 748. Virginius and Sidonius, two priests in the province of St. Boniface, Apostle of Germany, reported to Pope Zachary that a certain priest, from ignorance of Latin, had mangled the form of baptism and said, "Baptizo te, in nomine Patria et Filia et Spiritus Sancti," and that St. Boniface had ordered such baptisms to be repeated. Upon this Pope Zachary wrote to St. Boniface his famous letter of July 1, 748: "Most holy Brother: If he who baptized spoke as above, not for the sake of bringing in error or heresy, but marring the language simply from ignorance of the Roman tongue, we cannot consent to their being rebaptized."

Therefore, if this priest had not made

the change from mere ignorance, but from the intention of introducing error or heresy into the form of the sacrament, he would have been judged not to intend to do what the Church does through her form. Now, in the case of Anglican ordinations we have seen that the authors of the Ordinal changed the rite which they found approved by the Church and they changed it substantially or in what is necessary for a sacrament by the institution of Christ, or specifically in the essence of the form. What was the intention of the authors in this change? It certainly was not ignorance. It certainly was the intention of bringing in error and heresy contrary to the nature of the sacrament of Orders as instituted by Christ.

¹ Did the authors of the Ordinal believe

that Orders is a sacrament? Certainly not. The Twenty-fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles says: "There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, *Orders*, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but *yet have not like nature of sacraments* with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, *for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.*" Here they plainly teach that Orders is not a sacrament.

Did the authors of the Ordinal believe

that the Mass is a sacrifice? No. The Thirty-first of the Thirty-nine Articles says, "The sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, was the leading spirit among the authors of the Thirty-nine Articles and of the Ordinal and Communion Service, and his belief on Orders and the Mass is well known. We have many passages of his writings expressing this same doctrine of the Thirty-first Article, that in the Eucharist there is no true objective sacrifice. 3

What do we conclude in the present circumstances from the fact that the authors

of the Ordinal believed and professed that Orders are not a sacrament and the Mass is not a sacrifice? We conclude that when they changed the form of the sacrament of Orders from what they found in the Pontifical to that in the Ordinal, which positively omits the priesthood and the sacrifice that belong to the nature of the sacrament from the institution of Christ, we conclude that this change was for the set purpose of bringing in their errors and heresies against the existence of the sacrament of orders and of the sacrifice of the Mass, and that the intention of doing what the Church does was absent and that a contrary intention was present. And we conclude, finally, that ordinations according to the Edwardine Ordinal were rightly declared by Pope Leo and his prede-

cessors to be null and void on account of defect of intention in the Ordinal.

What do you say to the objection that Rome to be logical should condemn Russian Orders as invalid, because the longer Russian catechism of 1839 says nothing about the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ? I answer that, even though this alleged fact be granted as true in the sense quoted, it makes no parallel and proves nothing. This catechism does not deny the existence of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ as does the Thirty-first Article. The Russian *books of theology* approved by the Holy Synod clearly teach that the Mass is the objective and also propitiatory sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Russian Missal is in entire harmony with the Roman on the sacrifice

and the priesthood, and above all, the Russian Ordinal is not deficient in its essential form as is the Edwardine Ordinal. And we must always remember that Rome's argument from the omission of the sacrificial idea in the Edwardine Ordinal is not from mere omission, but from an omission that is truly a *positive exclusion*. Rome has always recognized Russian orders, and some of us may have read in the newspapers that here recently in New York City an Anglican minister after being received into the Russian Church was reordained by the Russian bishop. And not only the Russians, but all the other Orientals, and not only all Orientals, but all Protestant denominations outside the Anglican or Episcopal Church, and even within the Anglican Church the large majority of clergy and

laity of all times, or all except the minority or High Church, agree with the Pope's interpretation of the Edwardine Ordinal, that it does not make a sacrificing priest and was never intended to make one by its original authors.

Here the writer rests the case of Rome *vs.* Canterbury in the matter of Anglican ordinations. He has tried to give the theology of both sides in a nutshell. Whilst keeping his promise to be short, he has tried also to be full, and he has not consciously shirked any of the objections of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York that seemed to have force to puzzle the mind. He has addressed Catholics directly, but he trusts that while meeting difficulties by the full explanation of Catholic truth, he has kept his promise of saying

things in a courteous and charitable manner that takes no delight in hurting feelings, and that with this statement of the laws and facts of the case, any reader may securely judge it for himself.

APPENDIX.



CONSPECTUS.¹

OF EASTERN AND WESTERN RITES, BY WHICH
IT MAY BE SEEN THAT IN ALL CASES THE
PRAYER ACCOMPANYING THE LAYING ON OF
HANDS CONTAINS WORDS WHICH DETERMINE
THE ORDER CONFERRED.

This Conspectus is taken from a memorandum entitled, “ Brevis Conspectus Ritualium Ordinationum in Oriente et Occidente adhibitorum quoad Formam Consecratoriam cum Manuum impositione conjunctam,” drawn up by the Very Reverend Father Gasquet, Father David, and Canon Moyes, and submitted to the Commission.

I. ANCIENT ROMAN LITURGY.

Ordination (Two Bishops place and hold
of the Book of the Gospels upon his
Bishop,

¹ From *The London Tablet*, March 6, 1897, p. 365 *sqq.*

head, and while one says over him the blessing, all the other Bishops who are present touch his head.)

CONSECRATION.

“ . . . And therefore to these Thy servants whom Thou hast chosen to the ministry of the HIGH PRIESTHOOD. . . . ”

(When a Priest is ordained, the Priest, Bishop blesses him, and laying hand upon his head, and also all the Priests. . . .)

CONSECRATION.

“ Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, in this Thy servant the dignity of the PRIESTHOOD.”

(When a Deacon is ordained, Deacon. the Bishop alone who blesses him, lays hand upon his head.)

CONSECRATION.

“ Look mercifully, we beseech Thee, O Lord, also upon this Thy

servant whom we humbly dedicate to the office of DEACON to serve in Thy Sanctuary."

II. ANCIENT GALLICAN.

Ordination
of
Bishop,

(Two Bishops place and hold the Book of Gospels upon his head, and while one says over him the Blessing, all the other Bishops who are present touch his head.)

CONSECRATION.

" . . . And, therefore, to these Thy servants whom Thou hast chosen to the ministry of the HIGH PRIESTHOOD . . . give grace."

Priest,

(When a Priest is ordained, the Bishop blesses him and lays hand upon his head, and also all the Priests. . . .)

CONSECRATION.

"Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, in this Thy serv-

ant the dignity of PRIESTHOOD."

(When a Deacon is ordained, the Deacon. Bishop alone who blesses him lays hand upon his head.)

CONSECRATION.

"Look mercifully, we beseech Thee, O Lord, also upon this Thy servant whom we humbly dedicate to the office of DEACON, to serve at Thy Altars."

III. GREEK LITURGY.

(The Archbishop . . . laying Ordination
hands upon him, prays thus:) of
Bishop,

"Do Thou, O Lord of all, strengthen and confirm this Thy servant, that by the hand of me, a sinner, and of the assisting ministers and fellow-Bishops, and by the coming, the strength, and the grace of the Holy Ghost . . . he may obtain the EPISCOPAL dignity."

Priest, (The Archbishop, laying his hand upon him, prays thus:)

“O God, who by the title of PRIEST dost honor those who are judged worthy to administer in that rank, with holiness the word of truth . . . make perfect Thy servant that . . . he may deport himself worthily in that great PRIESTLY honor.”

Deacon. (The Archbishop having laid hands on him, prays thus:)

“Do Thou, O Lord, this man whom it has pleased Thee that I should promote to the office of DEACON. . . . preserve . . . him in all gravity of conduct. Give to him the grace which Thou hast given to BLESSED STEPHEN, the proto-martyr.”

IV. MARONITE LITURGY.

Ordination of Bishop, (Then the Bishop [Pastor] raises his hands and extends his

arms, and lowers them thrice upon the head of the person who is being ordained.)

“Thou who canst do all things, adorn with all virtues . . . this THY servant whom Thou hast made worthy to receive from Thee the sublime ORDER OF BISHOPS.”

(The [Bishop] places his right Priest, hand on his head.)

“Choose, O Lord, and this Thy servant to the PRIESTHOOD. . . . And grant him to discharge worthily . . . the PRIESTHOOD of Thy Kingdom.”

(The Bishop lays his right hand Deacon. on his [the Ordinand's] head, saying orally in a low tone the prayer:)

“Do Thou, O Lord, look upon Thy servant and send down upon him the grace of the Holy Ghost . . . And as Thou didst give

grace to BLESSED STEPHEN, whom
Thou didst first call to this MIN-
ISTRY."

V. NESTORIAN.

Ordination
of
Bishop.

(The Bishop puts his right hand
on the head of him who is being
ordained and says:)

"We offer before Thy Majesty
. . . this Thy servant whom
Thou hast chosen and set apart
that he may be a BISHOP."

Priest.

(And the Bishop says in a low
tone of voice over them while he
puts his right hand on their
heads:)

"Do Thou, therefore, O great
God of strength . . . look upon
these Thy servants . . . and
choose them to the PRIESTLY
OFFICE."

Deacon.

([The Bishop] puts his right
hand on their heads, and extends

his left in the manner of prayer, and says over their heads:)

“Lord God . . . who didst choose Thy Holy Church, and didst raise up in her prophets, apostles, priests, and doctors, and didst also place in her DEACONS . . . even as Thou didst choose STEPHEN and his companions, so now also, O Lord, . . . give to these Thy servants the grace of the Holy Spirit that they may be chosen MINISTERS.”

VI. COPTIC.

(Lay thy right hand on the head of the newly-called. . . . Ordination of Bishop,
The Bishops extend their hands and touch his neck and shoulders.
The Patriarch says the prayer of Ordination:)

“O Lord God, Almighty Ruler, . . . bestow, therefore, this

same grace upon Thy servant N.,
whom Thou hast chosen as
BISHOP."

Priest,

(The Bishop lays his right hand
upon his head, praying thus:)

"O Lord God Almighty, look
upon this Thy servant N., who
is presented to Thee for the
PRIESTHOOD."

Deacon.

(The Bishop lays his right
hand upon his head, and says this
prayer in a low tone of voice:)

"O Lord God Almighty, we
beseech Thee that Thou wouldst
show Thy countenance on this
Thy servant N., who is presented
to Thee for the **DIACONATE**. . . .
Fill him with the Holy Ghost
and with wisdom and strength,
as Thou didst fill **BLESSED
STEPHEN**."

VII. ARMENIAN.

(The Archbishop says:)

Ordination
of
Bishop,

“The Divine Grace calleth this
N. from the Priesthood to the
EPISCOPATE. I impose hands.
Pray that he may become worthy
of the rank of BISHOP.”

(Then follows the long prayer
in which grace is invoked on the
new Bishop.)

(The Bishop puts his right hand Priest,
on the head of the initiated, pray-
ing thus:)

“O Lord God, give grace to this
Thy servant that he may possess
the rank of PRIESTHOOD.”

(The Bishop lays on his hand:)

“O Lord, Thou hast chosen and
received him to the PRIESTHOOD.
Preserve this Thy servant now
ordained immovable in this
PRIESTHOOD.”

Deacon.

(Then the Bishop lays for the second time his right hand on the head of the new Deacon, saying:)

“O Lord God, make the grace of Thy Spirit to rest on this Thy servant N., who approaches to the ordination of the MINISTRY of Thy Holy Church.”

(The Bishop lays his hand for the third time on his head, saying:)

“The Divine and Heavenly Grace . . . calleth this N. from the subdiaconate to the **DIACONATE.**”

(Again, laying hands on him, saying:)

“O Divine and Heavenly Grace, which always supplies the need of the Ministry of the Apostolic Church, call N. from the subdiaconate to the office of the **DIACONATE.**”

“Give him the grace and strength of Saint STEPHEN, the proto-martyr and **FIRST DEACON.**”

VIII. LITURGY ON THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE APOSTLES

(One of the first Bishops with two others standing near the altar, while the other Bishops and Priests silently praying, and while the Deacons, holding the Divine Gospels on his head, shall say to God:)

Ordination
of
Bishop,

“Give, O God . . . to this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen to the EPISCOPATE to feed Thy people and discharge the Office of PONTIFF.”

(When thou, O Bishop, wilt ordain a Priest, lay thy hand upon his head, and with the circle of Priests and Deacons standing by thee, say thou thyself in prayer:)

“Lord Almighty, our God . . . do Thou now look down upon this Thy servant, who by the vote and judgment of the whole

clergy is admitted to the PRIESTHOOD."

Deacon.

(Thou shalt make a deacon, O Bishop, by laying hands upon him, while the whole body of Priests and Deacons stand by thee, thou say in prayer:)

"O Almighty God, show Thy countenance upon this Thy servant chosen to Thee in the DIACONATE (ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΝ), and fill him with the Holy Ghost and with strength as Thou didst fill STEPHEN, the 'First Martyr.' "

IX. "CANONS OF HIPPOLYTUS."

Ordination
of
Bishop,

(But then let one of the Bishops and Priests who shall lay his hand on his head pray, saying:)

"O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . look down upon Thy servant N., granting him Thy strength and power, the spirit

which Thou didst give to the holy Apostles, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Give to him, O Lord, the EPISCOPATE."

(But if a priest is ordained, all Priest, is done with him in like manner as with a Bishop, except that he shall not sit in the chair. The same prayer shall be prayed in its entirety over him as over the Bishop, with the sole exception of the name of EPISCOPATE. A Bishop is in all things equal to a Priest except in the name of the chair, and in Ordination, which power of ordaining is not given to the latter.)

"O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . look down upon Thy servant N., granting him Thy strength and powerful spirit which Thou didst give to the holy Apostles, through our

Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Give to him, O Lord, the PRIESTHOOD."

Deacon.

"O God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we earnestly beseech Thee pour forth Thy Holy Spirit on this Thy servant N., and prepare him with those who serve Thee according to Thy will, even as STEPHEN. . . . Accept his service, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

8546

265.412 S25

Semple, Rev. H. C.

AUTHOR

Anglican Ordinations

TITLE

DATE
LOANED

BORROWER'S NAME

DATE
RETURNED13
23
25
31
39

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

